

**Experimental studies of light propagation and storage
in warm atomic gases**

H. Gao, M. Rosenberry*, J. Wang, H. Batelaan

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Nebraska – Lincoln,

116 Brace Lab, Lincoln, NE 68588-0111

**Department of Physics, Sienna College, 515 Loudon Road, Loudonville,*

NY 12211-1462

We report on an experimental study of light pulse propagation and storage in a Rb atomic vapor for different pulse durations, magnetic fields, and atomic densities, and for two different isotopes. The results have been analyzed and compared with previous studies.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Gy, 03.67.-a

The resonant interaction of light with three-level Λ -type atoms has attracted considerable attention in recent years. Due to the dramatic change of the index of refraction of the atomic vapor close to resonance, many interesting effects occur [1-9], important examples of which are electromagnetically induced transparency (EIT) [1] and ultraslow group velocity [2,6]. By now both the EIT effect and the slow group velocity for a pulse of light have been well studied. With the combination of these two techniques, light can be stored and stopped with modest absorption in the atomic ensemble, as has been demonstrated recently [10-19]. The light storage technique may provide a feasible way to realize a kind of quantum memory for photons [15] and high-efficiency photon counting [20]. There are a large number of parameters that affect the practicability of the storage of light technique. The purpose of this paper is to study the dependence of some of the essential experimental parameters that are readily accessible. The specific questions that we address here are the ones we asked while setting up our experiment: (a) “How fast should the pulse be?”, (b) “How good should the magnetic field shielding be?”, (c) “In what temperature range can storage be achieved?”, and (d) “Can we use the ^{85}Rb isotope in stead of ^{87}Rb ?”

(a) Recently theoretical studies show [10,15] that the pulse spectral width should be contained within the EIT transparency window to avoid loss and dissipation, which is known as the adiabatic condition. If the pulse is too short then the atomic population should not respond to setup EIT within the signal pulse duration. By reducing the light pulse duration the frequency width of the pulse can be made increasingly larger than the EIT transparency

window and one can study how much dissipation occurs, and how the light storage would be affected.

(b) The above information depends on the external magnetic fields since these conditions can directly change the atomic EIT properties. On the other hand, nonlinear magneto-optic rotation (NMOR) can also occur in the resonant interaction of light with atoms in a Λ -type atomic structure. NMOR is an optical rotation effect and can be used in high-precision laser spectroscopy and magnetometry [5-9]. Typically, optical rotation induced by an atomic system in steady state is studied. However, because the control laser is switched, it is important in this study to distinguish the time-dependent optical rotation effects from the light storage. This means that observing a time-dependent signal with the two peaks that look like the typical pre-storage and post-storage pulse, does not necessarily mean that storage has been observed. The act of switching on the control laser can produce a peak that looks like a post-storage signal, even in the absence of a signal pulse.

(c) The EIT also depends on the atomic density. At low Rb cell temperatures the smaller atomic density makes the EIT signal too weak to be detected. At high Rb cell temperatures the absorption of the laser pulse is too strong to allow a signal to be observed.

(d) Finally, by comparing light storage in ^{87}Rb vapor, to storage in ^{85}Rb , one might expect a stronger signal, since the ^{85}Rb isotope is more abundant than the ^{87}Rb isotope.

In this paper, we find that storage of light works for pulse durations of several μs to 100 μs , which in some cases does satisfy and in other cases

does not satisfy the adiabatic condition. For linear polarization it is not easy to distinguish the light storage from the optical rotation when an ambient magnetic field is present. We find that optical rotation occurs at the time when control light switches on again, which results in a nontrivial storage signal. To avoid this, good magnetic shielding (within 2 mG) is necessary. We find the working temperature to range from 65-90 ° C. We demonstrate storage in ^{85}Rb and determine the optimum detuning for the strongest storage signal.

The experimental setup is schematically shown in Fig.1b, and is similar to the recent light storage experiment [12, 16-18]. Throughout this study we are using linearly polarization light. An extended cavity diode laser with < 300 kHz bandwidth is used as the linearly polarized light source. An acoustic-optical modulator (AOM) and iris allow for rapid switching of this source. The linearly polarized laser light can be slightly rotated by a fast Pockel's cell ($\sim 100\text{ns}$) to create a weak pulse, which is the signal field. The polarization of the weak pulse is perpendicular to that of the remaining light, which serves as the control field. Our Rb cell is 4 cm long, 2 cm diameter, and contains about 5 Torr of Helium buffer gas. A solenoid is placed around the Rb cell to precisely control the static magnetic field along the propagation direction of the laser beam. The solenoid is enclosed within double layered magnetic shielding to insure long lifetimes of the atomic Zeeman coherence. The atomic density can be varied by an Aerobias heater cable, which is wrapped around the magnetic shielding. A polarizing beam splitter (PBS) and two photodiodes comprise the detection system. The PBS separates the

control and signal fields after the light has passed the Rb cell, and sends them to the different photodiodes. To create the EIT effect, the laser frequency is adjusted to the D1 transition for ^{87}Rb ($\lambda=794.987$ nm), i.e., $5S_{1/2}$, $F=2 \rightarrow 5P_{1/2}$, $F=1$, which is checked by observing the fluorescence and absorption spectrums. Alternatively the laser is adjusted to the D1 transition for ^{85}Rb ($\lambda=794.984$ nm), i.e., $5S_{1/2}$, $F=3 \rightarrow 5P_{1/2}$, $F=2$. The laser beam diameter is about ~ 5 mm with an output power of ~ 8 mW (2.5 mW incident on the cell).

We now proceed to describe our experimental results. (a) We first perform the experiment of slow light propagation and storage of light for different signal pulse durations. The results are shown in Fig. 2a and 2b, respectively. We emphasize that two experimental situations are considered. In the slowing experiment (where the signal pulse is delayed after propagation through the Rb cell) the control field is always present, while in the storage experiment the control field is switched off and on. In the slowing experiment, the original signal pulse duration (Δ_{pulse}) and the reference pulse maximum intensity (I_{ref}) are measured off-resonance, while the Δ'_{pulse} and I' are pulse duration and maximum intensity are measured on-resonance. From Fig. 2a (open circles), we find that the pulse becomes broader at small pulse durations, which corresponds to a wider frequency spectral width. In addition, associated with the pulse broadening is a decrease of the pulse maximum intensity, which means more absorption occurs (squares). The broadening effect is nearly eliminated for pulses longer than $30 \mu\text{s}$ duration, while the light intensity still increases slightly with the pulse duration. The inset of

Fig. 2a shows the relation of the pulse delay time to the pulse durations. It is found that the delay increases with pulse duration and also saturates after the characteristic time of $30 \mu s$. We also found that this characteristic time increases with higher temperatures.

In the light storage experiment, the time sequence of the control and signal fields is the same as in Ref. [12] with a storage time of $130 \mu s$. Light storage efficiency (η) is calculated as the ratio of the maximum light intensity between post- and pre-storage (or output and input) after subtracting the leakage from the control beam. The light storage efficiency increases with pulse durations (Fig. 2b).

(b) When a magnetic field is applied along the laser propagation direction, the slow light intensity, I_{s-slow} , shows a dispersion curve as a function of the magnetic field (Fig. 3a_{ii}, filled squares), while the storage signal, $I_{s-store}$, shows three peaks (Fig. 3b_i filled squares). The pulse delay at different magnetic fields is maximum around zero magnetic field (Fig. 3a_{iii}, left). When we do not send a signal pulse, but only look at the control light, we see the effect of optical rotation. The intensity in our signal detector due to optical rotation of the control field, $I_{c-rotate}$, is given when the control light is continuously on and reached steady state (Fig. 3a_i, open squares). The optical rotation signal shows a nice symmetric structure with respect of zero magnetic field for the steady state. The intensity in our signal detector due to optical rotation of the control field, $I_{c-rotate}$, is also given at the time when control light turns on again (Fig. 3b_i, open squares). In this case, the optical rotation signal shows four peaks. This means that at non-zero magnetic fields

signals are generated that look like storage signals in the absence of a signal pulse (Fig. 3bii).

(c) The effect of different atomic densities on light slowing and storage are shown in Fig. 4a and 4b. The total atomic density (with abundances for ^{85}Rb of 72% and for ^{87}Rb of 28%) is estimated from the cell temperature by using Killian's (semi-empirical) formula [21], $N(/cm^3) = 10^{10.55-4132/T}/(1.38 \times 10^{-16}T)$, where N and T are the atomic density ($/cm^3$) and cell temperature (K), respectively. For the slowing experiment an increased pulse delay is observed for higher atomic densities (Fig. 4a). The inset of Fig. 4a shows the pulse broadening effect at different temperatures. For the light storage experiment the efficiency increases for higher atomic densities (Fig. 4b).

We now turn our attention to the discussion of our above results. First we give the general framework in which our experimental results can be understood. For our present results it is sufficient to consider the Λ -type structure for the linear-linear coupling case. More detailed theoretical studies on light propagation and storage in three-level systems can be found in Refs. [15,22,23]. Typically, the susceptibility for a resonant laser field propagating through an ideal, homogenous EIT medium can be expressed as [3,15],

$$\chi = \kappa\gamma \frac{\delta}{\Omega_c^2 - \delta^2 - i\gamma\delta}, \quad (1)$$

where, $\kappa = 3N\lambda^3/8\pi^2$ is a constant, λ is the resonant laser wavelength, γ is radiative decay rate of the excited level to the ground level, and $\delta = \omega - \omega_0$ is the laser detuning. The dispersion relation of light propagation in such a

medium, $(kc/\omega)^2=1+\chi$, can be found from substituting plane waves in the wave equation. This can be reduced to

$$kc/\omega = 1 + \chi/2, \quad (2)$$

for small values of the susceptibility near resonance, where ω and k are the light circular frequency and wave number. Generally, the susceptibility is divided into real and imaginary parts: $\chi = \chi' + i\chi''$. For the real part the index of refraction is $n = 1 + \chi'/2$ and for the imaginary part the absorption coefficient is $\alpha = \omega\chi''/2c$. After the light pulse propagates through the atomic vapor cell of length L , the intensity of the pulse is attenuated by a factor of $\exp(-2\alpha L)$, which as a function of frequency gives the usual EIT transmission profile. The group velocity is defined as, $v_g = \partial\omega/\partial k$, which can be obtained by differentiating Eq. (2) with respect to ω , $v_g = c/(1 + \omega/2 \cdot \partial\chi'/\partial\omega)$. To obtain this relation, $\chi' \ll \omega \partial\chi'/\partial\omega$ has been used. This approximation is justified by Eq. (1) near resonance. After the light pulse propagates through the atomic vapor cell of length L , its envelope is delayed compared to free space propagation by a time $T_g = L/v_g - L/c = \frac{L}{c} \cdot \frac{\omega}{2} \cdot \frac{\partial\chi'}{\partial\omega}$.

Optical rotation can be understood by considering the two orthogonal circularly polarized components of a linearly polarized beam. The two components couple the two atomic lower states to the upper state in a Λ -type atom. Suppose the upper state has $m = 0$ and two lower states have $m = \pm 1$. In the presence of a magnetic field along the light propagation direction, the Zeeman effect gives a frequency shift $\pm\mu_B B/\hbar$ to the two lower states, where μ_B is the Bohr magneton. Thus the two circularly polarized fields experience

two different indices of refraction and optical rotation occurs. The rotation angle, $\Delta\theta$, can be defined as [24] $\Delta\theta = 2\pi/\lambda \cdot [n(\omega_+) - n(\omega_-)] \cdot L/2$, where $\omega_{\pm} = \omega_0 \pm \mu_B B/\hbar$ and ω_0 is the resonant circular frequency.

Now we proceed to apply the above general considerations to our results. (a) Increasing the time duration of the signal pulse leads to a decreasing spectral pulse width. Starting with a very short pulse would mean that the spectral pulse width exceeds the EIT window and the size of the output pulse is very small. The time duration of the output pulse is limited by the Fourier transform of the EIT window. Conversely, when the time duration of the signal pulse has become very long, its spectral width is much narrower than the EIT window. Consequently the pulse is fully transmitted without broadening. In Lukin and Fleischhauer's paper [3,15], the EIT transparency window is given by

$$\Delta\omega_{trans} = (\Omega^2/\gamma)/(\kappa kL)^{1/2}. \quad (3)$$

In our experiment, the incident laser power on our Rb cell is 2.5 mW, while 0.25 mW exits after cell with a 5 mm beam diameter. The Rabi frequency ($\Omega = \sqrt{I\gamma^2/2I_s}$, I is the laser intensity, $I_s = 1.6\text{mW/cm}^2$ is the Rb saturation intensity) associated with these laser beam powers is estimated to be about 12 MHz and 3.8 MHz, respectively. The predicted transparency window [Eq. (3)] is thus bounded by 300 kHz and 30 kHz. The experimental data is fitted to the Fourier transform of the product of a Gaussian pulse and the EIT transmission profile. This gives an observed transparency window width of 50 kHz (Fig. 2a, solid line), i.e., within the expected range. The

same calculation (assuming an EIT transmission of about 70% [12]) also gives the maximum output intensity (Fig. 2a, dashed line). Because the pulse is partially outside of the transparency window its intensity decreases for shorter pulses (Fig. 2a, squares). We would expect that the intensity would exponentially increase with the same time constant as the pulse width exponentially decreased. However, we find that the intensity still increases after the pulse broadening effect stops. This may be due to optical rotation at small but non-zero magnetic fields ($< 2\text{mG}$, our detector resolution). This suggestion is supported by our observation of even larger light intensities when we increase the magnetic field ($\sim 5\text{ mG}$, filled squares in Fig. 2a). The optical rotation increases with intensity, which in its turn increases with pulse duration. We also find that the temporal delay increases with the pulse durations until the pulse width matches the EIT window (inset of Fig. 2a). For the light storage experiment, a similar effect causes the storage efficiency increase (Fig. 2b) with pulse duration.

(b) Increasing the magnitude of the magnetic field leads to less EIT [12] and more optical rotation (Fig 3ai). Steady state optical rotation has been extensively studied before (see, e.g., [7,8]). Our optical rotation at steady state shows a symmetric structure with respect to zero magnetic field (Fig. 3ai, open squares). The detector direction is chosen orthogonal to the electric field vector of the control light. Optical rotation of this electric field vector ($\Delta\theta$) into the direction of the detector explains the symmetry (inset of Fig 3ai). The solid line is obtained from a density matrix calculation for a three level atomic Λ -system. The calculated optical rotation can be obtained

by relating the density matrix coherences to the indices of refraction as experienced by the circular light components of the control light. The small asymmetry in the calculation is due to the use of a slightly different light intensity for σ^+ and σ^- .

When an orthogonal linearly polarized signal light is present, the optical rotation causes the detected signal to be asymmetric with respect to zero magnetic field as is shown in Fig. 3a_{ii} (filled squares). This contrasts to the situation for circularly polarized light where a symmetric profile can be observed. The inset of Fig. 3a_{ii} illustrates the observed asymmetry. Signal light is generated by optical rotation from the control light in the Pockel's cell. Optical rotation due to the Rb vapor ($\Delta\theta$) towards the detector direction increases the signal, and vice versa. This feature is also obtained from our model calculation (Fig. 3a_{ii}, solid line).

We find the delay of the signal pulse shows a sharp peak at zero magnetic field (Fig 3a_{iii}, left). This peak is similar to the usual EIT absorption profile for circular polarized light (Fig 3a_{iii}, right). This can be understood by realizing that the EIT absorption rate is proportional to χ'' , while the time delay is proportional to $\partial\chi'/\partial\omega$.

Unlike the steady state, the optical rotation shows some different features when the control light turns on again. A time spectrum shows a peak (Fig. 3b_{ii}), which we will refer to as switch-induced-optical rotation (SIR). As a function of magnetic field this SIR gives four peaks in our experiment (Fig. 3b_i, open squares). This result can again be simulated qualitatively from our model (inset of Fig. 3b_i). Associated with the SIR, the regenerated storage

signal after simply subtracting the SIR shows three peaks (note that it is still partially from SIR). These three peaks are due to storage signal and rotation signal. Since SIR affects the storage signal dramatically, one should be very careful when interpreting light storage in the presence of a magnetic field. Our further theoretical analysis shows that SIR is sensitive to the experimental conditions, such as atomic density, light intensity, light polarized states, and spin decoherence time, etc. Even the qualitative features such as the number of peaks is sensitively dependent on these experimental parameters. This situation contrasts the case of circular polarization. Then the optical rotation does not play a role, which gives clean storage signals.

(c) The time delay of the slowed signal pulse increases with atomic density (Fig. 4a). This is expected because the expression for T_g is proportional to the atomic density. In addition, for fixed pulse duration, as the atomic density increases, the EIT transparency window becomes narrower [3,15]. The slowed pulse thus becomes broader and smaller. This effect is shown in the inset of Fig. 4a. Larger pulse delays lead in the storage experiment to larger stored signals (Fig. 4b). For the highest atomic densities the storage efficiency decreases due to enhanced absorption from nearby hyperfine levels.

(d) So far, all the above experiments are done in ^{87}Rb vapor. Can storage be achieved in the ^{85}Rb isotope? For this purpose we adjust our laser frequency to $\lambda=794.984$ nm, i.e., the $5S_{1/2}$, $F=3 \rightarrow 5P_{1/2}$, $F=2$ transition for ^{85}Rb . The hyperfine structure is similar to ^{87}Rb . By choosing the operating temperature a little lower than that used for ^{87}Rb , we find the light storage signal for ^{85}Rb , shown in Fig. 5. The maximum storage efficiency is

always lower than ^{87}Rb and storage is seen in a somewhat limited temperature range (60-75 ° C). We suspect that this is related to the details of the hyperfine structure. Although the hyperfine structure is similar, the exact level spacings are different. Indeed, the storage efficiency as a function of detuning is quite different for ^{85}Rb (inset of Fig. 5). Note that our storage time spectrum shown is taken at a laser frequency -400 MHz detuned from resonance.

In summary, we have experimentally studied resonant light pulse propagation and storage in a warm Rb atomic vapor for different experimental parameters and can answer the four questions raised in the introduction. We find (a) the light storage signal still exists at very small pulse duration (several μs in our experimental case). However the slowing signal pulse becomes broad and small. To avoid this effect, the signal spectral bandwidth should be within the EIT transparency window, which is about 50 kHz in our experiment. The size of the EIT transparency window is found to depend on the vapor temperature. (b) We have measured the magnetic field dependence of the slowing and storage signals. One might expect that the magnetic fields should be limited to the extent that the Zeeman shifts are within the EIT window. However, we find it is better to shield the magnetic field to within ~ 2 mG (2.8 KHz) for light storage. The reason is that for linearly polarized light switch-induced-optical rotation (SIR) can mask the storage signal. (c) Storage could be achieved in a temperature range of about 65-90 ° C, which corresponds to the atomic density of $0.46 \times 10^{12}\text{cm}^{-3}$ to $3 \times 10^{12}\text{cm}^{-3}$. For the temperature larger than 90 ° C, the storage signal decreases due to the

absorption. (*d*) Finally, we demonstrate light storage for ^{85}Rb . The light storage efficiency is probably influenced by the close proximity of other hyperfine lines. This also limits the storage temperature range of 60-75 ° C for ^{85}Rb .

This work was supported by a Nebraska Research Initiative (NRI) Grant. We thank B. Williams for his work on the apparatus.

References

- [1] See, e.g., S.E. Harris, *Phys. Today* **50** (7), 36 (1997).
- [2] M.M. Kash, V.A. Sautenkov, A.S. Zibrov, L. Hollberg, G.R. Welch, M.D. Lukin, Y. Rostovtsev, E.S. Fry, and M.O. Scully, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 5229 (1999).
- [3] M.D. Lukin, M. Fleischhauer, A.S. Zibrov, H.G. Robinson, V.L. Velichansky, L. Hollberg, and M.O. Scully, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2959 (1997).
- [4] A.S. Zibrov, M.D. Lukin, L. Hollberg, D.E. Nikonov, M.O. Scully, H.G. Robinson, and V.L. Velichansky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 3935 (1996).
- [5] D. Budker, V. Yashchuk, and M. Zolotarev, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5788 (1998).
- [6] D. Budker, D.F. Kimball, S.M. Rochester, and V.V. Yashchuk, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1767 (1999).
- [7] I. Novikova, A.B. Matsko, and G.R. Welch, *Opt. Lett.* **26**, 1016 (2001).
- [8] V.A. Sautenkov, M.D. Lukin, C.J. Bednar, I. Novikova, E. Mikhailov, M. Fleischhauer, V.L. Velichansky, G.R. Welch, and M.O. Scully, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 023810 (2000).
- [9] M. Fleischhauer, A.B. Matsko, and M.O. Scully, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 013808 (2000).
- [10] M. Fleischhauer and M.D. Lukin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 5094 (2000).
- [11] O. Kocharovskaya, Y. Rostovtsev, and M.O. Scully, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 628 (2001).

- [12] D.F. Phillips, A. Fleischhauer, A. Mair, and R.L. Walsworth, and M.D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 783 (2001).
- [13] C. Liu, Z. Dutton, C.H. Behroozi, and L.H., Hau, Nature (London) **409**, 490 (2001).
- [14] A.S. Zibrov, A.B. Matsko, O. Kocharovskaya, Y.V. Rostovtsev, G.R. Welch, and M.O. Scully, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 103601 (2002).
- [15] M. Fleischhauer and M.D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 022314 (2002).
- [16] A. Mair, J. Hager, D.F. Phillips, R.L. Walsworth, and M.D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 031802(R) (2002).
- [17] M. Kozuma, D. Akamatsu, L. Deng, E.W. Hagley, and M.G. Payne, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 031801(R) (2002).
- [18] H. Gao, M. Rosenberry, and H. Batelaan, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 053807 (2003).
- [19] M. Bajcsy, A.S. Zibrov, and M.D. Lukin, Nature (London) **426**, 638 (2003).
- [20] A. Imamoglu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 163602 (2002); D.F.V. James and P.G. Kwiat, *ibid.* **89**, 183601 (2002).
- [21] T. J. Killian, Phys. Rev. **27**, 578 (1926).
- [22] J.H. Eberly, A. Rahman, and R. Grobe, Laser Phys. **6**, 69 (1996).
- [23] M.G. Payne, L. Deng, C. Schmitt, and S. Anderson, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 043802 (2002).
- [24] D.A.V. Baak, Am. J. Phys. **64**, 724 (1996).